

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's objection to the Abstract as not being presented on a separate sheet is not understood--and leads to worry that Applicant's preliminary amendment of April 12, 2005 has not yet been properly entered. In any event, the above amendment further modifies the Abstract and also presents it on a separate sheet.

The objection to claims 4, 6-8, 12, 14 and 15 as allegedly being "independent" claims that reference the limitations of another independent claim are also not understood. The statute (35 U.S.C. §112, paragraphs 3-4) specifically permits the applicant to present a claim in dependent form, containing a reference to a claim previously set forth and then specifying a further limitation of the subject matter claimed. In accordance with the statute, a claim presented in this authorized dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all limitations of the claim to which it refers.

Accordingly, applicants claims 4, 6-8, 12, 14 and 15 are all legitimate dependent claims that are in complete compliance with the statutory provisions (and relevant regulations in title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations).

Nevertheless, these claims have been amended above so as to hopefully assist the Examiner in keeping track of the limitations in the various claims and understanding the claimed invention and/or so as to improve clarity and avoid duplication.

It is noted that the Examiner's only mention of claim 5 is to object to it as being dependent from a rejected base claim. Accordingly, claim 5 has been amended to self-standing independent format and is now assumed to be in fully allowed status.

The rejection of claims 3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the “written description requirement” is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner apparently objects to the fact that the original specification does not use this particular word “inverse.” Accordingly, these claims have been amended above so as to use the exact verbiage in the specification (“mirror image”) as will be found, for example, at pages 23-25 in conjunction with Figures 14-16 and/or appendix A giving more concrete instructions on an exemplary technique for identifying the minimum number of verbs required to express all the rules relating to a subject (or a set of subjects) to an object (or a set of objects). Clearly there is considerable “written description” enabling those skilled in the relevant art to make and use this aspect of the applicant’s claimed invention.

It is noted that the Examiner indicates that this limitation has “not been considered” in making prior art rejections. Accordingly, in view of the above explanation, it is respectfully requested that this limitation be considered in the Examiner’s reconsideration of this application.

Accordingly, all outstanding formal issues are now believed to have been resolved in the applicant’s favor.

The rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly anticipated by Wedde is respectfully traversed.

Wedde describes a distributed authorization concept. While conflicts between rules inherited from higher ranking groups are mentioned as something that must be detected and resolved, the Wedde approach is markedly different from the applicant’s claimed invention.

Most of the Wedde paper is involved with explaining the modular authorization architecture of the system to be analyzed. Emphasis is given to localized authorization teams having their own localized “authorization spheres.” The discussion seems to be primarily of

human members of a given authorization team working together to define access rules and to resolve conflicts when two inheritance streams are merged into a subordinate authorization sphere (e.g. see 3.2.4).

When it comes to formal specification of a distributed heterogeneous system, Wedde first assumes at section “4.”, on page 100 that for the entirety of his remaining disclosure, for the purpose of simplicity, it is assumed that the authorization structure is homogenous within each authorization sphere in that all authorization rules are present at each node/group within the sphere. He then defines a modular authorization language with a fixed set of predicates divided into access predicates and feature predicates. Access predicates model the access rights while the feature predicates describe the characteristic of subjects and objects which have to hold if the access should be granted. Symbology is then described as are feature predicates and access predicates. The whole of the Wedde teaching with respect to conflict resolution is found at section 5 and/or section 6.2. Wedde teaches that “conventional approaches” can be used to remove or void what are called “violations.” However, when a “conflict” is deemed to have occurred, Wedde teaches:

“Our principal for conflict handling is that all involved authorization teams in the affected spheres have to collaborate to resolve the problem...as a result, from the inherited rules new and conflict-free rules will be created in appropriate ways. These resolutions for the affected authorization sphere will be inherited to all of its subordinate spheres...”

What follows is a description of various ways in which the corresponding authorization teams might change the scopes of contradicting rules or the like so as to resolve conflicts. Basically, it appears that Wedde uses “resolution strategies:” pessimistic, optimistic, general accepting or definition of exceptions.

Nowhere in Wedde is there anticipation of applicant's claimed invention. For example, claim 1 requires receiving semantic data representing a graph structure of hierarchical semantic relationships between available system commands, including those in the set of system operating rules; expanding the system operating rules according to allowable hierarchical semantic relationships between the available system command portions to give, for any particular system operating rule, an additional system operating rule for each hierarchical semantic level in the graph structure below the system command present in that particular rule. Claim 1 also requires comparing the expanded system rules to identify those rules for which a semantic conflict occurs therebetween.

While the Examiner has quoted applicant's claim language for claim 1 and made parenthetical reference to various portions of Wedde that allegedly disclose all of these features, when those cited portions of Wedde are actually examined, they do not support the allegation.

For example, the Examiner alleges that claim element 1(c) can somewhere be found in Wedde at page 97, abstract, lines 6-19. It cannot. This text merely briefly mentions that conflicts, if they exist, need to be resolved. It offers no teaching whatsoever with respect to the applicant's specifically claimed particular way of resolving conflicts.

Similarly, at page 97, right column, lines 18-43. This text actually most describes the distributed authorization team concept and only briefly again mentions that there may be conflicts between inherited rules and that something has to detect and resolve those conflicts. Once again, there is no teaching whatsoever of any particular way to resolve those conflicts---let alone the applicant's particularly claimed way of identifying or resolving conflicts.

Similarly, at pages 99-100, sections 3.1 and 3.2, Wedde is merely describing the groups and roles and authorization spheres of his assumed modular authorization architecture. There is

no teaching whatsoever in this cited text as to any particular way of resolving conflicts—let alone the applicant’s particularly described and claimed way of identifying or resolving conflicts.

Page 102, section 4.5 actually deals only with evaluation of access requests. It merely notes that if different grant rules have conflicting results (i.e., a so far undetected conflict or violation), the response is “error.” This would actually seem to suggest that whatever Wedde’s technique for conflict identification or resolution might be, it is not a very good one.

Similarly, at page 102, section 5, lines 1-8, Wedde simply notes that if conflicting results are evaluated in a given single authorization sphere, the reason might be (a) that the rules created in the lower authorization sphere are contradicting to one inherited from a higher one (which Wedde indicates could be resolved in some undescribed “conventional” approach) or (b) that rules inherited from more than one authorization sphere happen to be contradicting. Once again, this portion of section 5 does not even begin to explain how Wedde proposes to actually identify or resolve conflicts.

In short, none of the text cited by the Examiner even begins to teach (or suggest) the applicant’s specifically described and claimed technique for identifying conflicts in a set of system operating rules (e.g., see claim 1) – let alone the applicant’s specific way of resolving such conflicts (e.g., see claim 4).

At some places in the Examiner’s comments, an “Examiner Note” states that “paragraph 12 applies.” The undersigned not sure what “paragraph 12” the Examiner might be referring to. If it is the numbered section 12 appearing on page 10 of the Office Action, then that, in turn, appears to refer to and incorporate by reference earlier numbered paragraphs 9-11 which fall generally under a discussion of “examination considerations.” These statements by the Examiner appear to be disembodied quotes or summaries of some case law or repeated

assertions, such as, statements that the Examiner has “full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense.”

While it is certainly true that Examiners in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office are supposed to construe claim language to have the broadest reasonable meaning to those skilled in the art at the relevant time, this is also supposed to be accomplished within the context of the specification. This also does not give complete license to the Examiner to reinterpret words to mean things that they obviously do not mean (either in the applicant’s claims or in the cited references). As noted above, the substance of the prior art teachings relied upon by the Examiner does not meet the substance of the applicant’s claimed features. Merely quoting the applicant’s claim language and then citing to sections of prior art documents which may contain one or more words that are similar or the same as one or more words in the cited passage does not support a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

The distinguishing comments noted above for independent claim 1 also apply to applicant’s independent claim 9 -- as the Examiner’s own comments acknowledge.


Given such fundamental patentable distinction between Wedde and applicant’s independent claims 1 and 9, it is not believed necessary at this time to detail further deficiencies of this reference with respect to the alleged anticipation of other features of the independent claims or of the various rejected dependent claims. Suffice it to note that, as a matter of law, it is impossible for any reference to anticipate a claim unless it teaches each and every feature of that claim.

MAJIDIAN
Appl. No. 10/531,054
December 21, 2007

Accordingly, this entire application is now believed to be in allowable condition and a formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Harry S. Nixon
Reg. No. 25,640

LSN:kmr
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100